

Re: the end of our sun–white dwarf or red giant?

Re: the end of our sun–white dwarf or red giant?

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2006–10/msg00237.html>

- *From:* Saul Levy <saullevy1@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 26 Oct 2006 21:26:08 –0700
-

The Sun isn't massive enough to form a neutron star. Next is the red giant stage, then a white dwarf.

Saul Levy

On Thu, 26 Oct 2006 06:07:43 GMT, "Androcles"
<Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"kajlina" <china_108@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1161841587.065523.197700@xx
| >From "The case of the missing neutrino" by John Gribbon, written in
| 1997, our sun would turn into a white dwarf after death. From "Parallel
| worlds" by Michio Kaku, written in 2005, our sun would turn into a red
| giant after death.
|
| Which one is correct? Or are both cases possible? Or white dwarf was a
| previous theory while red giant is a more recent one?

"After death" is meaningless, but yes, both are possible. It is inevitable that eventually all the hydrogen "fuel" is converted to helium and so a helium core is gradually growing in our sun. Inside that is an even heavier but smaller core as the helium is "consumed" and the final state is thought to be a neutron star like Matryoshka dolls. However, the star can go supernova before that happens and the entire process is largely conjecture. This is an obvious expansion:
<http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/ap011227.html>

Androcles